UNITED NATIONS **S**

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1998/608
2 July 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL PREPARED PURSUANT TO RESOLUTION 1160 (1998) OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The present report is submitted pursuant to Security Council resolution 1160 (1998) of 31 March 1998. It covers the period since my last report of 4 June 1998 (S/1998/470).

II. SECURITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ESTABLISHED PURSUANT TO RESOLUTION 1160 (1998)

2. As at 30 June 1998, the following 43 States had reported to the Committee, pursuant to paragraph 12 of resolution 1160 (1998) on the steps they had taken to give effect to the prohibitions imposed by the resolution: Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Uruguay.

III. COMPREHENSIVE REGIME TO MONITOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROHIBITIONS IMPOSED BY SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 1160 (1998)

3. In my last report (S/1998/470) dated 4 June 1998, I informed the Security Council that, in the light of the response from the Chairman-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) dated 1 June 1998 and in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 15 of Security Council resolution 1160 (1998), I had written to the Secretary-General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Presidency of the European Union (EU), the Secretary-General of the Western European Union (WEU) and the Executive Director of the Danube Commission with a view to exploring their readiness to participate in the comprehensive regime and to submit to me, on the basis of information that may be available to them, reports on suspected violations of the prohibitions

imposed by the resolution for consideration by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1160 (1998).

4. As at 30 June, I had received an interim reply from the Secretary-General of NATO dated 11 June, as well as replies from the Secretary-General of WEU dated 18 June, the Acting President and the Secretary of the Danube Commission dated 23 June 1998 and the Presidency of the European Union dated 30 June 1998. The full text of those replies is annexed to the present report (annexes I-IV).

5. The Secretary-General of NATO informed me that a study by the NATO Military Authorities on possible support for the monitoring regime would be completed shortly, and, once it had been considered by the North Atlantic Council, the Secretary-General would contact me again. He stated that in the meantime, the NATO-led Stabilization Force (SFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina was using its authority under Annex 1A of the 1995 Peace Agreement to step up its efforts, within the existing mission and capabilities, to monitor the Bosnian border with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to prevent the transfer of weapons. He expressed the readiness of NATO to share SFOR findings with the United Nations.

6. WEU expressed its readiness to provide any useful information that comes to its notice on the implementation of the measures imposed by resolution 1160 (1998), in particular through its Multinational Advisory Police Element (MAPE) established in Albania at the request and with the cooperation of the Albanian authorities. WEU also stated that it was in the process of considering its role with regard to the very serious developments in Kosovo and their implications for regional stability. While seeking further information on the nature of a comprehensive regime for enforcement of the prohibitions contained in resolution 1160 (1998), WEU expressed its interest in taking any relevant action in full transparency and partnership with other organizations, including EU and NATO, and in agreement with the neighbouring countries on whose territories any relevant operation would take place.

7. The Danube Commission stated that in the event that OSCE or another international organization should offer the framework for coordinating the monitoring under resolution 1160 (1998), the Commission would be prepared to contribute, within the areas of its competence and expertise, to the accomplishment of this task through its support and advice concerning navigation on the Danube and the facilitation of transit of vessels, goods and passengers in compliance with resolution 1160 (1998). At the same time, the Commission suggested that a well-defined mechanism should be devised in due course to deal with cooperation between the authorities responsible for conducting inspections under the sanctions system and organizations and representatives of the shipowners, shippers and consignees of goods on the Danube.

8. The Presidency of EU welcomed my initiative to seek its views, as well as those of other organizations, on the enforcement of Security Council resolution 1160 (1998). The member States of EU agreed to assist the Committee established pursuant to paragraph 9 of Security Council resolution 1160 (1998) by providing information on the action taken by them to implement the resolution and by making available information on alleged violations of the arms embargo. The Presidency also expressed the readiness of EU members to contribute to international efforts to monitor the embargo by asking the European Community

Monitoring Mission (ECMM) to report to the Committee any relevant information on the movement of arms that should come into its possession as a result of its operations in Albania, Bosnia, Croatia, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. EU is seeking a significant increase in the number of monitors in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia/Kosovo, in line with President Milosevic's undertaking in Moscow on increased international monitoring, and has increased the number of its monitors in northern Albania. The monitors would be tasked to be alert for any evidence relevant to the implementation of resolution 1160 (1998).

9. I will submit my recommendation, as required in paragraph 15 of the above-mentioned resolution once I have received all necessary information.

IV. SITUATION IN KOSOVO

10. As the Council is aware, the situation in Kosovo has deteriorated significantly since the submission of my last report. A new outbreak of violence in early June led to an influx of refugees to Albania and to an increase in internally displaced persons in Kosovo and Montenegro. The number of registered refugees in Albania at the end of June was 6,900. In addition, an estimated 3,150 have departed to southern Albania. It is estimated, however, that there may be as many as 13,000 refugees more in Albania. As of 19 June, the Montenegrin authorities had registered another 10,177 internally displaced persons from Kosovo. According to estimates of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), some 45,000 people have been displaced within Kosovo itself. UNHCR is unable to assess the situation on the ground more precisely, since it cannot gain access to the affected areas.

11. Anticipating that further deterioration of the situation might lead to a major humanitarian and refugee crisis in the area, United Nations agencies expanded their activities in the region. In addition to the UNHCR office in northern Albania, the World Food Programme (WFP) also opened an emergency office there on 17 June. UNHCR continues to lead inter-agency contingency planning in the region. On 15 June, the Office of the Coordinator for Humanitarian Affairs, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), UNHCR, WFP and the World Health Organization (WHO) launched the consolidated inter-agency flash appeal for humanitarian assistance needs related to the Kosovo crisis: 1 June-31 August 1998. The appeal is aimed at obtaining US$ 18 million for multisectoral assistance for the United Nations system, of which UNHCR is seeking US$ 12.9 million. Coordinating mechanisms are operating in Pristina, Belgrade, Podgorica, Tirana and Skopje. WFP is stockpiling food in Pristina - rations are now sufficient to feed 35,000 for one month. In northern Albania, WFP is ready to start distribution of 500 tons of food assistance, which would cover existing needs until September.

12. In its resolution 1160 (1998), the Security Council requested me to keep it regularly informed on the situation in Kosovo and to provide an assessment of whether the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had complied in a constructive manner with conditions put forward by the Contact Group. By the time of writing of the present report, I had received the relevant information from the Chairman-in-Office of OSCE, which I attach in annex V.

V. OBSERVATIONS

13. The international community is appalled by the continued violence in Kosovo. The parties concerned must demonstrate restraint and resume negotiations to find a peaceful solution to the conflict. I am increasingly concerned that, unless hostilities in Kosovo are stopped, tensions could spill across borders and destabilize the entire region. Kosovo therefore becomes a key issue for the overall stability of the Balkan region. I welcome the diplomatic efforts being made at the international level to address fundamental aspects of the situation which can only be resolved through negotiation.

14. It has been widely reported that authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia have agreed to allow foreign diplomats and accredited international organizations in Belgrade to monitor the situation in Kosovo. The process of establishing that monitoring presence is reportedly under way. Such a monitoring mission would improve the ability of the international community to assess directly the situation on the ground and could better serve the desire of the international community and the Security Council for impartial and substantive information regarding Kosovo. Should this come about, the Council may wish to review the continued need for reporting by the United Nations on the situation in Kosovo, as requested in paragraph 14 of resolution 1160 (1998), in view of the absence of a United Nations presence in Kosovo to provide an independent assessment of that situation.

Annex I

Letter dated 11 June 1998 from the Secretary-General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization addressed to the Secretary-General

Thank you for your letter of 4 June 1998 in which you sought the views of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) on the establishment of a comprehensive monitoring regime for the prohibitions imposed on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia by Security Council resolution 1160 (1998) of 31 March 1998.

As I informed you in my letter of 29 May, the North Atlantic Council has tasked the NATO Military Authorities to study possible support for the monitoring regime. This study will be completed shortly, and I will write to you again once it has been considered by the North Atlantic Council.

In the meantime, the NATO-led Stabilization Force (SFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina is using its authority under Annex 1A of the 1995 Peace Agreement to step up its efforts, within the existing mission and capabilities, to monitor the Bosnian border with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to prevent the transfer of weapons. We are making the necessary arrangements to forward any information on suspected violations in the SFOR area of operations to NATO headquarters for onward transmission to the United Nations Secretariat, via the monthly SFOR reports or on an ad hoc basis as necessary.

(Signed) Javier SOLANA

Annex II

Letter dated 18 June 1998 from the Secretary-General of the Western European Union addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to thank you for your letter of 4 June in pursuance of Security Council resolution 1160 (1998) of 31 March 1998, which I have drawn to the attention of the Permanent Council. I am now replying on the Council's behalf.

The Western European Union (WEU) welcomes your initiative to include our organization in your consultations on this important matter. WEU has repeatedly made clear its readiness to act in support of and - as appropriate - under mandates from the United Nations, as well as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

At present, as you know, the only mission being conducted by WEU in the region concerned is the Multinational Advisory Police Element (MAPE) established in Albania at the request and with the cooperation of the Albanian authorities. MAPE is a training and advisory mission whose mandate includes assistance with the training of all Albanian police forces and advice on their future organization; its activities thus contribute to the development of the capacity of the Albanian authorities themselves, inter alia, for implementation of the embargo. WEU is ready to provide immediately, by the appropriate means, any useful information that comes to its notice on the conditions of implementation of the embargo.

WEU shares your concern for the effective implementation of resolution 1160 (1998). As indicated in the declaration recently adopted by our Ministers at their meeting in Rhodes, we are in the process of considering the role of our organization in relation to the very serious developments in Kosovo and their implications for regional stability. To make sure that the WEU Council can include in its deliberations any possible practical contributions that might be appropriate for us in that context, we would be happy to receive further information or proposals on the nature of a "comprehensive monitoring regime" for enforcement, as mentioned in your letter. I might add that we would expect to take any relevant action in full transparency and partnership with other institutions, including the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and in agreement with the neighbouring countries on whose territory any relevant operations would take place.

(Signed) Jose CUTILEIRO

Annex III

Letter dated 23 June 1998 from the Acting President and the Secretary of the Danube Commission addressed to the Secretary-General

Allow us to thank you for your letter of 4 June 1998, in which you included the Danube Commission in the consultations pursuant to paragraph 15 of Security Council resolution 1160 (1998) of 31 March 1998, thus recognizing the role of our international intergovernmental organization in the Danube region.

One of the main tasks of the Danube Commission is to ensure implementation of the provisions of the Convention concerning the regime for navigation on the Danube, which provide that "navigation on the Danube shall be free and open for the nationals, vessels of commerce and goods of all States, on a footing of equality". Hence the Danube Commission believes that any monitoring system to be established under the above-mentioned resolution and to be operated by the appropriate institutions must respect this fundamental principle of navigation on the Danube, which is based on international law and recognized by the entire international community.

Without prejudice to the provisions of resolution 1160 (1998), which must be applied in full, or to the Charter of the United Nations, it must be ensured that, when sanctions are applied by the United Nations, the interests of "innocent and neutral" transit navigation on the Danube of countries that are not the object of the sanctions are respected and protected. Not only is this navigation essential to the economies of the landlocked Danubian countries, it is also important for some 40 nations that use the Danube each year as a major European waterway.

In the event that the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) or another international organization should offer the framework for coordinating the monitoring, the Danube Commission would be prepared to contribute, within the areas of its competence, to the accomplishment of this task through its support and advice concerning navigation on the Danube and the facilitation of "innocent" transit of vessels, goods and passengers. To the extent that a control system becomes inevitable, the Danube Commission hopes that the institutions responsible for this task will take advantage of the experience of the experts of the Commission and the Danubian countries in matters related to navigation on the Danube.

At the same time, a well-defined mechanism should be devised in due course to deal with cooperation between the authorities responsible for conducting inspections under the sanctions system and organizations and representatives of the shipowners, shippers and consignees of goods on the Danube.

If the implementation of such a monitoring system causes losses to the navigation on the Danube of countries that are not the object of the sanctions but experience their consequences, a mechanism for compensating for those losses should be devised as soon as possible.

(Signed) Petru CORDOS
Acting President of the Danube Commission
Representative of Romania on the Danube Commission

(Signed) Felix P. BOGDANOV
Secretary of the Danube Commission
Representative of the Russian Federation on the Danube Commission

Annex IV

Letter dated 30 June 1998 from the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland addressed to the Secretary-General

Thank you for your letter of 4 June, addressed to me in my capacity as President of the European Union, seeking the views of the States members of the European Union on the establishment of a regime to monitor the arms embargo on the Federal Government of Yugoslavia imposed by Security Council resolution 1160 (1998).

The European Union welcomes your initiative in seeking its views, as well as those of other regional organizations, on the enforcement of Security Council resolution 1160 (1998), the aim of which we strongly support. The States members of the European Union have agreed to assist the committee established under paragraph 9 of resolution 1160 (1998) in its work by providing information on the action taken by member States to implement the resolution and by making available to the Committee any information available to member States on alleged violations of the embargo. I have asked member States to pool such information so that the Presidency of the day can pass this on to the committee.

The EU and its member States also stand ready to contribute to international efforts to monitor the embargo by asking the European Community Monitoring Mission (ECMM) to report to the Sanctions Committee any relevant information on the movement of arms that should come into its possession as a result of its operations in Albania, Bosnia, Croatia, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

The European Union is seeking a significant increase in the number of monitors in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia/Kosovo, in line with President Milosevic's undertaking in Moscow on increased international monitoring. The European Union has also increased the number of its monitors in northern Albania. The European Union will ensure that its monitors are tasked to be alert for any evidence relevant to implementation of resolution 1160 (1998). The European Union would also be willing to consider any further proposals from the Secretary-General or other regional organizations on a monitoring regime.

Robin COOK

Annex V

Information on the situation in Kosovo and on measures taken by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, submitted pursuant to paragraphs 13 and 16 of Security Council resolution 1160 (1998)

I. INTRODUCTION

The further deterioration of the situation in Kosovo and along the border between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Albania since the May report to the Secretary-General has prompted the Contact Group to impose a package of economic sanctions on both the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Serbia to induce them to seek a political solution to the problem. For its part, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) produced an array of crisis scenarios, and on 15 June staged a display of air power in the airspace of Albania and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, along the border with Kosovo.

II. THE DIALOGUE

On 15 May in Belgrade, President Milosevic and Dr. Rugova agreed on weekly working contacts between the two sides. However, so far only one such meeting has been held, in Pristina (on 22 May). The Albanian side contended that the military-cum-police operation unleashed on south-west Kosovo by Belgrade in late May and the whole of June precluded its participation in further meetings of this kind.

Those of the Kosovo Albanians who do not count among the supporters of Rugova's policy line have made known their displeasure with his meeting with Milosevic. Representatives of the so-called Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) have strongly reiterated their direct objective, namely, the independence of Kosovo.

By 16 June 1998, no signs had emerged of a possibility of resumption of the Belgrade-Pristina dialogue. The issue was taken up during the Milosevic-Yeltsin meeting in Moscow on 16 June.

The two sides to the Kosovo conflict have had numerous contacts over the past month with representatives of foreign countries visiting Yugoslavia, and also with diplomats posted in Belgrade. Dr. Rugova has visited the United States of America, Italy and France and has met with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

III. VIOLENCE

A further deterioration of the situation was recorded in Kosovo soon after the Milosevic-Rugova meeting, notably in the Yugoslav-Albanian borderland and along the Pec-Dechani, Djakovica-Prizren and Pristina-Pec highways. Serious armed clashes were noted in those areas.

The wholesale destruction visited upon the Albanian villages in the process sent consecutive waves of refugees streaming out of the area. Casualty figures released by both sides differ considerably. The Serbs maintain that their actions had a purely anti-terrorist character and claim only a "negligible" number of victims, while the Albanians insist scores have been killed (no credible data about the number of victims are available, but some unofficial sources indicate there might be over 200 dead). Many observers agree that the range and scope of combat operations validates the contention that a guerilla war is now under way in Kosovo.

More people these days are prepared to cross illegally into the war-torn Yugoslav province from Albania, and contraband weapons are pouring into Kosovo, brought there by armed groups of ethnic Albanians.

The media quote the Belgrade office of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to the effect that the combat operations in Kosovo have displaced 30,000 to 40,000 Albanians, who have now established temporary residence in other parts of the province or left for Albania (around 12,000) or Montenegro. On the other hand, there has been no confirmation of the earlier Albanian reports of their countrymen streaming into the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The Serbians argue that the Albanians overstate the facts and inflate the figures, but they do not counter them with their own information.

In the opinion of A. Demaci, Chairman of the Parliamentary Party of Kosovo, carried by the media in early June, the Kosovo Liberation Army allegedly controlled an area of 3,000 square kilometres, including some 250 villages, with a total population of 700,000 to 800,000, most of them in the Drenica region.

IV. EDUCATION

Serb students and professors in Pristina do not agree to hand over to the Albanian side a part of the premises of the local university. A student demonstration was recently dispersed by the police, while the Serb educational authorities made a hasty decision to end the academic year ahead of schedule.

V. ACCESS TO KOSOVO

The armed clashes resulted in a temporary closure in May and June of the Pristina-Pec and Pec-Decani-Djakovica-Prizren sections of the highway, with telecommunication lines severed partially within this area and a news blackout of several days imposed by the authorities. Instances of Serb troops stopping food transports and other supplies being sent from the north to Kosovo have been noted. In early June, the Serb side regained control over the aforesaid sections of the highway, which were then reopened to traffic.

Members of the KLA stop travellers in KLA-controlled areas (notably in the Drenica region), check their identification documents and often confiscate items they find of use. For instance, Japanese and American television crews were relieved of their bullet-proof vests.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, on 7 June, conducted a tour of Kosovo for diplomats posted in Belgrade, who reported on the widespread destruction of housing in the now-abandoned villages affected by the hostilities at the end of May/beginning of June. However, those diplomats did not confirm the allegations of some Kosovo Albanians that the Serb authorities had subjected the area to heavy artillery and aerial bombardment.

VI. RISKS OF SPILLOVER

According to the reports of the OSCE presence in Albania, the situation on the Albanian border with Kosovo remains volatile. There has been almost daily military activity in western Kosovo since the end of May, causing large-scale displacement of civilians. Over 10,000 of them have fled to Albania, most of them women, children and the elderly. The violence has caused a drastic increase in militancy on both sides of the border. Armed resistance has become very visible, including cross-border movement of arms and men. Border incidents have increased, pointing to efforts on the part of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to clamp down on this movement. Recent incidents also involved border violations. There is increasing evidence of mines being laid, and there have also been a number of accounts from refugees of detention of men of military age.

The refugees have been accommodated by the local population in the border region, the poorest part of Albania. For the moment, their immediate needs are being met, but the totally inadequate infrastructure makes the long-term outlook grim.

Politically, the conflict causes problems for the Government in Tirana, in that it must take into account both national sentiments of indignation and solidarity, echoed by the opposition, and international calls for restraint.

The overriding priority is to secure an early end to the fighting, followed by the deployment of a large-scale international monitoring force. This would not only enable a meaningful dialogue to take place, but also facilitate an early return of the refugees.

The OSCE mission in Skopje reports that "spillover" from the current crisis in Kosovo in the territory of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia may take physical form (movement of individuals whether seeking refuge privately or coming as refugees) or political form (an adverse effect on ethnic relations in local politics). Hitherto the risks of physical "spillover" have been contained: there have been no refugees and no identifiable net inflow based on family ties; border areas are stable and calm, with life proceeding normally, albeit with increased anxiety among the local population; and there has been no serious incident, in recent months, on the country's border with Kosovo and the rest of Serbia, with reduced smuggling and illegal crossings. Any significant number of Kosovars arriving would be resented by the majority population. The key to continuing stability remains the policy approach of the Yugoslav border authorities on the northern side of the border. Should similar operations be launched to those in the Decani area, movement of refugees would be very likely, but the area has traditionally been relatively quiet.

In terms of risks of political 'spillover', ethnic Albanian demonstrations in Skopje and other towns, showing solidarity with Kosovars and voicing support for the KLA, although peaceful, have caused disquiet and resentment among the ethnic Macedonian population, complicating the political scene, which is otherwise dominated by forthcoming parliamentary elections.

VII. MEASURES TAKEN BY THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

Kosovo continues to be in the forefront of OSCE activities. It has become one of the priorities of its Chairmanship.

The latest developments in Kosovo have clearly demonstrated the necessity of participation by international organizations in solving the humanitarian problems in the region as well. This is why the OSCE Permanent Council stressed on 4 June the importance of free access for the International Committee of the Red Cross and other humanitarian organizations to the areas affected by fighting. The major influx of refugees arriving in Albania from Kosovo is being observed by OSCE.

At the end of May, the Chairman of the Parliamentary Assembly of OSCE, Mr. Javier Ruperez, visited the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia for talks in Belgrade and Pristina. He did not register any change in the position of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia vis-à-vis the Gonzalez mission or a prospective OSCE mission, including one in Kosovo.

OSCE has developed relatively modest but effective monitoring capabilities in Albania. The Organization decided on 4 June to increase the number of OSCE monitors on Albania's border with Kosovo to 30.

Addressing the Central Europe Initiative meeting in Brioni on 6 June, the OSCE Chairman-in-Office came forward with the idea of a special status for Kosovo. In his opinion, it should be elaborated through the dialogue between the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Kosovo Albanians. He suggested that a round table dialogue concentrating on special status for Kosovo would help resolve the dichotomy between independence and autonomy. This could be helpful in moving away from political rhetoric and turning to concrete matters, such as the functioning of legislative and executive powers there, assuring local identity, development of local government and education.

On 11 June, the Chairman-in-Office condemned violence by either side in the strongest possible terms and urged an immediate cessation of hostilities. He expressed his deep concern about the continued flow of refugees driven across the border into Albania by the violence. He called on the Belgrade authorities to facilitate the return of displaced persons and refugees.

In his address to the Permanent Council in Vienna on 17 June, the Chairman-in-Office stated that a political solution to the crisis required not only that hostilities in Kosovo be stopped and talks resumed, but also that democracy and full respect for human rights and minorities be introduced in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and that the participation of that country in

international organizations, including OSCE, be ensured once it applies international standards to its behaviour. The Chairman-in-Office repeated that the OSCE platform for a political solution is still available and that the Organization would be ready to dispatch a mission to Kosovo without delay, if and when it proved to be possible.

In his letter of 19 June to President Milosevic, the Chairman-in-Office showed interest in the suggestion by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to hold talks with OSCE on the acceptance of the OSCE mission in Kosovo and on the participation of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in OSCE (this proposal was made by the Yugoslav side after the Milosevic-Yeltsin talks in Moscow on 16 June and included in the joint statement).